

REMARKS

Claim 17 has been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

Withdrawal is requested.

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 on the basis of Hayashi, et al. '631 and Gillies, et al. '595. Applicants traverse this rejection because neither reference discloses or suggests, alone or in combination, apparatus or methods which include storing at least two program languages, and allowing vector representation of each of those programming languages, as in independent claims 1, 7, 13, 17 and 19.

The Examiner recognizes that Hayashi, et al. do not describe the use of at least two programming languages, and relies on Gillies, et al. for this feature. However, while Gillies, et al. suggests that several different languages can be translated into a common intermediate language using front end modules (column 7, lines 55-62), it does not disclose or suggest a table having assignment rules for multiple languages, to allow vector representation of each of those programming languages. Thus, even combined, the cited references would not produce the present invention. This is strong evidence of non-obviousness.

The present invention is adapted for use with programming languages that allow vector representation. This is an improvement over Hayashi, et al. (Mr. Hayashi is also an inventor of the present invention), which was not adapted for use with such programming languages. Gillies is also not adapted for programming languages which allow vector

representation. Thus, the present invention addresses and solves a problem not even recognized by either of the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 17 recites, among other things, intermediate code which is produced by a front end unit, before processing by an analyzing unit. Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 17 for the additional reason that the cited references do not disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 17. Specifically, Hayashi et al. fails to teach that intermediate data is processed for facilitating optimization between the front end and the optimizing unit. Gilles et al. also fails to teach that intermediate data generated by the front end is processed for facilitating optimization, but merely describes the back end processing which corrects the generated object code to enhance the execution speed. For these reasons also, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, on the basis that claim 13 recites a product which is not limited to tangible products. Applicants traverse this rejection because a product is inherently tangible. The examples described on page 22 of the present specification include semiconductor storage devices such as ROM, magnetic storage media, such as floppy disks and hard disks, etc., and programmed hardware logic circuits such as an LSI. The specification also describes the situation in which program data is transferred through a communication network to a hard disk in a computer system on the receiving end of the communication network. In this case, the program data itself is not a claimed product. The product would be the hard drive on the receiving end of the network,

which is tangible. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

December 27, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978